

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,915	08/28/2006	Kari Raisanen	METSO-64	7851
36528 7590 66/14/2010 STIENNON & STIENNON 612 W. MAIN ST., SUITE 201			EXAMINER	
			FORTUNA, JOSE A	
P.O. BOX 1667 MADISON, WI 53701-1667			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/14/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/597,915	RAISANEN ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	José A. Fortuna	1791
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>José A. Fortuna</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>David Stiennon</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 8 June 2010	Time:	
Type of Interview:	nt's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate n directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate n did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summan	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/597,915

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants" attorney to inquire for the status of the application, because it has been more than six months since the last office action. Mr. Silennon indicated that they had not responded to the last office action, because they never received it. The examiner indicated that since the application was technically abandoned, i.e., no response after six months, then the case needs to go abandoned and he can file a petition to revive it.